

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 1, 2016
3:00-5:00 P.M.
107 LAB OF MECHANICS**

Present: Bigelow, T. (Academic Affairs); Brown, J. (Business); Butler, A. (Secretary); Day, T. (President-Elect); Derrick, T. (FDAR); Freeman, S. (CALs); Kimber, M. (Veterinary Medicine); Martin, P. (RPA); Padgett Walsh, C. (LAS); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Russell, D. (Human Sciences); Schaefer, V. (Engineering); Sponseller, B. (Governance); Sturm, J. (President); Wallace, R. (Past President); Wickert, J. (Senior VP and Provost); Zarecor, K. (Design)

Guests: Lohrbach, M.; Martin, R.; Schmidt, A.; VanderZanden, A.M.

I. Call to Order

President Sturm called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

II. Consent Agenda

A. Agenda, Executive Board Meeting November 1, 2016

B. Minutes, Executive Board Meeting October 11, 2016

Senator Schaefer moved to accept the consent agenda. Senator Freeman seconded. The motion passed without dissension.

III. Special Order: Learning Management Systems – Ann Marie VanderZanden, Director, CELT; Michael Lohrbach, Director, IT Systems and Operations; and Rose Martin, member IT Committee

Director VanderZanden provided a handout of Blackboard slides providing information about the upcoming review of learning management systems (LMS). The committee will offer a website with up-to-date information about the review, similar to the website for the Strategic Plan.

The review is jointly conducted by CELT and the CIO office. It will last from October 2016 to May 2017. The review will consider not just the current LMS but also other options.

Senator Bigelow said that whichever LMS is selected, it should be possible to port current software into the new LMS. People have invested time and resources into creating materials for LMS. Director VanderZanden said that that was included in the criteria for evaluating LMSs.

Senator Martin noted that the timeline for review is tight: August to December. Faculty would be nervous about the short time for transitioning to the new LMS. Director VanderZanden replied that faculty at UI waited until the last three weeks to make the transition to their new LMS, even though more time was available. Nevertheless, she said that we will have to manage the transition. She hopes to provide a minimum of 15 weeks

in the fall semester 2017 for people to begin working on the transition. Those teaching in the spring would have a longer timeline.

Senator Freeman pointed out that the contract with Blackboard does not expire until December 2017. Why would faculty have to make the transition in the fall? Director VanderZanden replied that that would be a possibility, but that it is complicated to support two different systems.

Professor R. Martin asked about Blackboard's transition to the cloud. Director Lohrbach said that Blackboard Ultra is "not ready for primetime" yet. Eventually everyone will have to make the transition from on premise to the cloud. We don't want to change to an on premise system and then have to move to the cloud again.

Senator Kimber asked what UI considered. Director VanderZanden said they considered Desire2Learn and Canvas and went with Canvas. UNI's contract will expire in December 2017, so they are watching UI and ISU's decisions carefully.

Senator Bigelow asked whether Testing Centers are being consulted in the review, because they use Blackboard extensively. Director Lohrbach said that Mark Woolley and Doug Bull participated. The needs of e-testing, lecturer capture and lecture hosting are being considered along with those of ISU faculty and students.

Senator Freeman observed that if a new LMS is contracted, it will have to be coordinated with the Registrar's databases. Director VanderZanden replied that ITS participates in discussions with the large ERP review group. Director Lohrbach said that when the RFP is issued for the LMS, any vendor (including Blackboard) can bid.

Senator Martin asked how long the contract would be for. Director Lohrbach said that contracts are typically between three and five years. Our current contract with Blackboard was three years. It may be possible to sign a three year contract with an optional two year extension.

Director VanderZanden said that the review committee is looking for ways to collect information from particular audiences. There will be a brief survey on the LMS website. Senator Freeman asked whether decision criteria will be determined once the RFP is finalized. Director Lohrbach said that the review committee is looking for guidance on what the requirements are, what the desirables are, and how to rank them. The hope is that the committee will agree on these. Then they will invite people to see the products in action, ask questions, and get more feedback. With that information, the committee will reevaluate the vendors. Senator Bigelow recommended setting up a computer system in MU so that faculty can try the product. Director Lohrbach said that most vendors have test beds with a number of accounts available online.

IV. Announcements and Remarks

A. President

President Sturm said that he would be happy to share his response to the flight services issue on behalf of the faculty.

B. President-Elect

None

C. Senior Vice President and Provost

Provost Wickert supplied three handouts: a list of his updates for EB; a forthcoming article from *Inside Iowa State* about the review of US Diversity courses; and an RFP for courses to satisfy the US Diversity requirement.

1. US Diversity Requirement

FS, CELT, the Provost's Office, and Student Government have been discussing courses that satisfy the US Diversity requirement. The RFP invites proposals of new courses or substantially revised existing courses that address current topics of social and political importance with respect to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

FS Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion committee is working with CELT to review the proposals. They will provide recommendations over break. The Provost's Office will make \$5,000 to \$10,000 available to provide support for materials, graduate student hires, etc.

2. LIB 160 Review

The committee met for the first time last week. It includes faculty, library staff, and students at different stages (a sophomore, senior, and graduate student who was an undergraduate at ISU). There is no set agenda for the committee; it is being asked to assess the efficacy of LIB 160. Are the learning outcomes being met? What changes should be made? Is the library requirement necessary? What recommendations do they have?

3. New Student Onboarding

Student Government proposed a course, "Cyclone 101," as a small (25 student) course. It would be difficult to offer these small sections to 7,000 students to cover 15 different topics every fall. But the proposal does highlight a problem. As enrollment has grown, issues about sexual assault, diversity, and financial literacy have surfaced. It is not clear that our current practices for new student onboarding are optimally effective. Should we onboard new students centrally? At the department level? At the college level? Before classes? In the first week of classes?

Senior VP Harmon is working on this matter. It is overload to try to cram all of this information into the first semester of students' first year. Some of the information needs to be reinforced in later years.

4. Tuition

Provost Wickert reported that he did not receive negative feedback at the BOR meeting about the tuition proposal. Students from all three schools spoke about the need for more support for mental health and expressed concern about the growing separation between resident and non-resident tuition. We won't know BOR's decision until the December meeting.

Past President Wallace asked what the BOR response was about the proposed differential tuition for different departments. Provost Wickert replied that he did not receive any negative feedback. We were told that we could not pursue the comprehensive differential tuition (upper/lower division students). So we're proceeding with the targeted departments. This is not ideal. It solves a problem for those five departments, but will create other problems. Provost Wickert speculated that if ISU demonstrates that it uses the differential tuition for the five departments responsibly, perhaps the upper/lower differential tuition will be feasible in the future.

Senator Freeman pointed out that the targeted differential tuition proposal creates management issues. For example, a student might major in Environmental Science for 3.5 years and transfer to Biology in the last semester to avoid the additional fees. How much will it cost to manage these issues? Provost Wickert replied that he didn't know. But he agreed that Biology does face certain problems, and the deans in LAS and CALS are working on them. Perhaps this will require a rule that Biology majors have to be declared for at least four semesters to get the degree. Similarly, there may be a limit on how many business classes non-majors can take.

Senator Zarecor pointed out an inequity that this creates. There is a course in the College of Business such that there are two sections. The section for majors is much smaller than the course for non-majors. She thought this illustrated that a piecemeal system has bad consequences for students. Provost Wickert thought that was a good example of the problem.

Senator Bigelow asked whether it would be possible to tie differential tuition to courses rather than programs. Provost Wickert replied that some schools do that, but we do not have the infrastructure.

5. Big 12 Provosts Visit

Provost Wickert participates in a number of external groups, including higher education associations, councils, and committees. The Big 12 Provosts meet twice a year to discuss academic programs on campus and other common concerns. This will take place on Sunday and Monday.

D. Council Chair Reports

Academic Affairs: none

FDAR: Item in New Business

Governance: An issue that came out of the Higher Learning Commission accreditation review was the need to define minimal criteria for hiring of faculty. What should we do with exceptions? This definition does not need to go into FH, but FS should provide input.

RPA: The Council finished work on committee restructuring. They forwarded proposals to Governance Council to change the Business and Finance Committee name to University Services. Governance Council will forward that to EB.

Senator Martin said that they had a productive meeting with CIO Kurtenbach. There continue to be some areas of concern, but he thought the discussion was good. Next week, RPA will meet with the Provost to discuss the preliminary budget and equality issues.

E. Caucus Chair Reports

CALS: The caucus discussed the co-curricular transcript proposal. How will this impact faculty, and why weren't faculty involved earlier in the discussion? Provost Wickert replied that there is information maintained by the Registrar's office. Some information comes from various systems (e.g. involvement in Student Government, work on a research project, University Honors, study abroad). These will appear as a university-verified activity. Then there are other activities (e.g. helped with a parade, club officer, internships). These will be differentiated. Provost Wickert thought that co-curricular transcripts would be helpful for job applicants, by keeping all of this information in one place. But it's also information that the university is interested in. Furthermore, students who are involved in campus life tend to do better: their grades are better and they graduate sooner.

Veterinary Medicine: None

LAS: The caucus will meet with the Dean later this month.

Human Sciences: No meeting with the Dean

Engineering: The caucus met with the Dean yesterday to discuss the college's Strategic Plan. There are lab safety and risk management issues. They also discussed student evaluations.

Design: The caucus will meet tomorrow. At the last meeting, they discussed differential tuition. The college is working to figure out what to do now that the differential tuition proposal is targeted. They will meet with the Dean at the end of the semester.

Business: The caucus discussed priorities for capital budgeting and journals.

V. Unfinished Business

A. Name Change: Women's and Gender Studies [S16-1] – Bigelow

No comments, no questions.

B. Master of Human Computer Interaction [S16-2] – Bigelow

No comments, no questions.

VI. New Business

A. FH 5.2.4.2.6 Faculty Information [S16-3] – Derrick

Senator Derrick said that FDAR tried to define what is factual information in FH 5.2.4.2.6. The current language is ambiguous. The goal was to specify which documents count as factual documents. Candidates have the right to review those factual documents and file a written request for changes in three working days.

Senator Zarecor asked for clarification. Could a dossier be sent to the college with competing accounts of factual information? Senator Derrick replied that with the current FH language that that was possible.

Senator Bigelow asked which documents are not generated by the candidate. Senator Derrick said that in some departments, parts of the dossier are compiled by people other than the candidate. Some senators expressed surprise at this.

Senator Bigelow asked why we need consistency across departments. This proposal takes the power of self-determination away from departments. President-Elect Day replied that consistency is needed for cases where the department summarizes the candidate's accomplishments and gets it wrong. Senator Bigelow said that the chair can say whatever they want about the candidate's accomplishments. But if it's possible that the candidate's accomplishments are misrepresented, then the chair's letter should be made available to the candidate. Senator Bigelow asked for a reason to prohibit a department from deciding to share the chair's letter with the candidate.

Senator Freeman thought it would be a bad idea to share the chair's letter with candidates. The chair frequently includes quotations from external letters. The letter is not factual, but evaluative. If a factual mistake is made, someone farther in the review process will catch it. He thought that the opponents to the proposal assumed that no one reads any part of the dossier except for the chair's letter (and dean's letter). Senator Bigelow replied that the names of the external reviewers could be redacted.

Senator Bigelow also raised concern about an insincere recommendation from a chair. The chair might claim to be recommending, even though he or she puts a negative spin on all of the candidate's accomplishments. At the next level, these negative points will be emphasized. He repeated his question of why the practice of what information is shared has to be uniform.

Senator Brown said that departments in the College of Business let candidates see letters with names redacted. They support doing so for the sake of transparency. And they think transparency is vital for fairness of process for the candidate. The candidate can see how the factual information is being used, couched, and spun. By making the letter available

to the candidate, the disagreement can be handled then and there. This process gives the candidate every possible opportunity to respond to how his or her accomplishments are represented.

Senator Martin thought two different issues were being conflated. One is the distinction between what information is factual and what is evaluative. The second is what information is shared and what is not shared.

Provost Wickert thought that Senator Bigelow's position should imply that departments can decide to share external letters with the candidate too. Senator Bigelow replied that the chair's recommendation carries significant weight in later stages of review. It is rare for the college or university to overturn the department's decision.

Senator Derrick thought that making letters available to candidates would have adverse effects on what the letter writer writes. Senator Bigelow repeated that he thought that the chair's letter carries special weight.

Provost Wickert said that when a case is negative, he looks at the third year review and annual evaluations.

EB judged that the proposal could not be forwarded to FS. Past President Wallace moved to end debate. Senator Bigelow seconded. The motion passed. It was decided that input from college P&T committees would be solicited.

B. FH 5.2.4.4.5 Appeals [S16-4] – Owen

Senator Freeman said that seven years ago, significant changes were made to FH 9 about the timeline for addressing P&T appeals. The goal was to keep appeals from continuing through the summer and into the fall. When these changes were made, there were no corresponding changes made to FH 5. The proposal defines the start of the appeal clock from when the letter from the Provost is sent.

President Sturm asked about the conditional claim "*If* a faculty member has a right..." Senator Freeman clarified that not all colleges recognize such a right. In non-mandatory cases, some colleges (CVM, CALS, COE) recognize the right for the candidate to send the dossier to the next level. The matter is clarified in college or departmental governance documents.

EB worked on clarifying the language in the proposal.

Senator Schaefer moved to accept the proposal as amended. Senator Sposneller seconded. The motion passed.

VII. Approval of the November 8, 2016 Faculty Senate Agenda

Item (VI)(A) was removed. Senator Freeman reminded President Sturm to update the docket numbering. Senator Freeman moved to accept the amended agenda. Senator Padgett Walsh seconded. The motion passed.

VIII. Good of the Order

President Sturm said that two Regents expressed interest in shadowing faculty. He also reminded senators to come early to the FS meeting for snacks provided by the Pan Hellenic organization. He also announced the Amara Piano Quartet performance in Recital Hall on November 6.

IX. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.